

# PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

EFS

From the  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

## PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY  
(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

To:

see form PCT/ISA/220

Date of mailing  
(day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)

Applicant's or agent's file reference  
see form PCT/ISA/220

**FOR FURTHER ACTION**  
See paragraph 2 below

International application No.  
PCT/DK2007/000232

International filing date (day/month/year)  
16.05.2007

Priority date (day/month/year)  
16.05.2006

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC  
INV. G06F17/30 G06Q10/00

Applicant  
TARGIT A/S

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☐ Box No. II Priority
- ☒ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☐ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☒ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. **FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA:



European Patent Office  
D-80298 Munich  
Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d  
Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Date of completion of  
this opinion

see form  
PCT/ISA/210

Authorized Officer

SAN-BENTO FURTADO, P

Telephone No. +49 89 2399-2140



**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.  
PCT/DK2007/000232

---

**Box No. I Basis of the opinion**

---

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
  - ☒ the international application in the language in which it was filed
  - ☐ a translation of the international application into , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (Rules 12.3(a) and 23.1 (b)).
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
  - a. type of material:
    - ☐ a sequence listing
    - ☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
  - b. format of material:
    - ☐ on paper
    - ☐ in electronic form
  - c. time of filing/furnishing:
    - ☐ contained in the international application as filed.
    - ☐ filed together with the international application in electronic form.
    - ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.  
PCT/DK2007/000232

---

**Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability**

---

The questions whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non obvious), or to be industrially applicable have not been examined in respect of

☐ the entire international application

☒ claims Nos. 1-13

because:

☐ the said international application, or the said claims Nos. relate to the following subject matter which does not require an international search (*specify*):

☒ the description, claims or drawings (*indicate particular elements below*) or said claims Nos. 1-13 are so unclear that no meaningful opinion could be formed (*specify*):

see separate sheet

☐ the claims, or said claims Nos. are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed (*specify*):

☐ no international search report has been established for the whole application or for said claims Nos.

☐ a meaningful opinion could not be formed without the sequence listing; the applicant did not, within the prescribed time limit:

☐ furnish a sequence listing on paper complying with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions, and such listing was not available to the International Searching Authority in a form and manner acceptable to it.

☐ furnish a sequence listing in electronic form complying with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions, and such listing was not available to the International Searching Authority in a form and manner acceptable to it.

☐ pay the required late furnishing fee for the furnishing of a sequence listing in response to an invitation under Rules 13<sup>ter</sup>.1(a) or (b).

☐ a meaningful opinion could not be formed without the tables related to the sequence listings; the applicant did not, within the prescribed time limit, furnish such tables in electronic form complying with the technical requirements provided for in Annex C-*bis* of the Administrative Instructions, and such tables were not available to the International Searching Authority in a form and manner acceptable to it.

☐ the tables related to the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing, if in electronic form only, do not comply with the technical requirements provided for in Annex C-*bis* of the Administrative Instructions.

☒ See Supplemental Box for further details

---

**Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application**

---

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

see separate sheet

**Re Item III.**

- 1 No detailed examination of the claimed invention as to Novelty, Inventive Step and Industrial Applicability in respect of claims 1 to 13 was carried out due to the severe deficiencies of the claims.  
As explained below under Item VIII, the subject-matter is described in the claims in such an unclear way, that it is not possible to establish the scope of protection defined by the claims.
- 2 Nevertheless, the above-mentioned lack of clarity notwithstanding, the following general observation about the application and claims can be made.  
The claims relate to presentation of information by means of a dashboard with a data meter. The claims define a method in technically vague and unclear terms, since no specific technical description is given of how the information is obtained or displayed (the same for the system, product and medium). It is not clear, which technical problem is being solved by the claimed subject-matter or by the invention described in the application. A significant part of the description refers to a system as described in prior art documents cited in the search report. Dashboard systems including data meters, as well as systems for retrieval of information based on some criteria, are well known. Presentation of information, as such, is not considered to make a contribution to an inventive step. Therefore, the claimed subject-matter apparently does not solve any technical problem and lacks an inventive step.

**Re Item VIII.**

- 3 The application does not meet the requirements of Article 6 PCT, because claims 1 to 13 are not clear.
- 3.1 Claim 1 refers to "a first value" in "displaying a first value by means of a data meter" without explaining what it is, how it is obtained or calculated or what its function in the method is. It is not clear whether it is related to "the first value from a specified measure".  
The expressions "a metric representing use of the metadata items for preparing graphical presentations" are "providing the first value from a specified measure in a

predefined way" are unclear.

The step of "preparing a graphical presentation" is not really explained, it is only a result to be achieved, which merely amounts to a statement of the underlying problem, without providing the technical features necessary for achieving this result.

The terms "dimension", "measure" and "metric" are not properly defined. The expression "the measure is specified by means of an enquired rating on the performance index, and/or an enquired value of the metric of use, and/or an enquired measure" is unclear.

Claim 1, targeted to a "method of preparing an electronic dashboard with a data meter for monitoring data", lists the steps of "preparing a graphical presentation...", "displaying a first value...", "recording the set of metadata items...", "rating the measure..." and "providing the first value...". It is unclear how these steps achieve the purpose of "preparing an electronic dashboard for monitoring data".

- 3.2 The expressions "criterion on the dimension" of claim 2 and "term of the dimension" used in claims 3 and 4 are unclear.
- 3.3 The sentence "determining which recorded metadata set that fulfil a predetermined criterion on the metric representing use and the criterion that the criterion on the dimension is used in combination with the measure" of claim 5 is incomprehensible and appears to be even grammatically incorrect.
- 3.4 Claim 5 is wrongly defined as depending on itself.
- 3.5 The sentences "property representing a desired development" of claim 7, "displaying a first value...comprises displaying a collection of values" of claims 9 and 10 are unclear or vague.